

**REMARKS**

This amendment is in response to the Office Action of September 15, 2006.

Claims 1, 5-17, 20, and 21 are currently pending in the application.

Claims 1, 11-17, and 20 have been amended herein.

Claims 2-4, 22, and 23 have been canceled herein.

Claims 18 and 19 were previously canceled herein.

Support for the amendments may be found throughout the specification, such as in paragraph [0013] and in claims 2 and 22 prior to their cancellation. No new matter has been entered to the disclosure as the amendment clearly complies with 35 U.S.C. § 132. The amendments are made without prejudice or disclaimer.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejections.

**Claim Objections**

Claims 1, 11, and 20 are objected to due to informalities in the claim language. Appropriate correction has been made.

**35 U.S.C. § 102(e) Anticipation Rejections**

**Anticipation Rejection Based on Docter et al. (U.S. Patent 6,330,610)**

Claims 1 through 17 and 20 through 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Docter et al. (U.S. Patent 6,330,610) (hereinafter "Dokter"). Claims 2-4, 22, and 23 have been canceled thereby mooting the rejection as to those claims. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Applicant asserts that a claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. *Verdegaal Brothers v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the claim. *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

Regarding presently amended independent claim 1, Applicant asserts that Dokter does not identically describe, either expressly or inherently, each and every element of presently amended independent claim 1 in as complete detail as contained in the claim to anticipate the claimed invention under 35 U.S.C. § 102. Applicant asserts that Dokter does not identically

describe the element of the claimed invention calling for “a printer including . . . a filtering program stored in a memory device or firmware of said printer.” Docter uses the phrase that “[t]he teachings of the present invention are applicable to any type of device containing a processor or controller capable of executing instructions.” *Column 3, lines 20-22*. That does not expressly or inherently identically describe a printer including a filtering program stored in a memory device or firmware of said printer. Therefore, for at least this reason, Docter does not anticipate presently amended independent claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102.

Accordingly, presently amended independent claim 1 is allowable.

Claims 5-10 are allowable for at least the reason of depending from allowable presently amended independent claim 1.

Claim 6 is further allowable since Docter does not describe expressly or inherently a filtering program that causes a processor to prevent a printing component from printing a file of a packet having at least one undesirable characteristic.

Claim 7 is further allowable since Docter does not describe expressly or inherently a filtering program that instructs a processor to cause a printing component to print a file of a packet having a desirable characteristic.

Claim 8 is further allowable since Docter does not describe expressly or inherently a filtering program that instructs a processor to cause a printing component to print a file only if a packet lacks an undesirable characteristic and has a desirable characteristic.

Claim 9 is further allowable since Docter does not describe expressly or inherently an undesirable characteristic comprising one of a file type, a file string, a source computer identifier, a user identifier, a file size, and at least one prespecified command.

Claim 10 is further allowable since Docter does not describe expressly or inherently a desirable characteristic comprising one of a source computer identifier, a user identifier, a file type, and a password.

Regarding presently amended independent claim 11, Applicant asserts that Docter does not identically describe, either expressly or inherently, each and every element of presently amended independent claim 11 in as complete detail as contained in the claim to anticipate the claimed invention under 35 U.S.C. § 102. Applicant asserts that Docter does not identically describe the element of the claimed invention calling for “receiving the

unfiltered printing packet at said printer . . . evaluating at said printer . . . said printing packet by a processor housed within said printer.” Docter uses the phrase that “[t]he teachings of the present invention are applicable to any type of device containing a processor or controller capable of executing instructions.” *Column 3, lines 20-22*. That does not expressly or inherently identically describe receiving an unfiltered printing packet at a printer and evaluating at the printer the printing packet by a processor housed within the printer.

Additionally, Applicant asserts that Docter does not identically describe the element of the claimed invention calling for “transmitting an unfiltered printing packet . . . from a source computer, across a network, to a printer of said network [and] receiving said unfiltered printing packet at said printer.” The data filtering system of Docter relates to “filtering data in multiple stages.” *Column 1, lines 66-67*. In its broadest sense, Docter requires filtering performed by “two or more devices.” *Column 3, lines 29-30; see also Column 2, lines 1-7*. Assuming solely for the sake of argument that Docter describes a printer as one of the devices, Docter would require filtering of data prior to that data being received by the printer. Docter does not expressly or inherently describe receiving an unfiltered printing packet at a printer.

Therefore, for at least these reasons, Docter does not anticipate presently amended independent claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 102. Accordingly, presently amended independent claim 11 is allowable.

Claims 12-17 are allowable for at least the reason of depending from allowable presently amended independent claim 11.

Claim 13 is further allowable since Docter does not describe expressly or inherently preventing processing of an at least one file of the printing packet by the printer if the printing packet has an undesirable characteristic.

Claim 14 is further allowable since Docter does not describe expressly or inherently permitting processing of an at least one file of the printing packet by the printer if the printing packet has a desirable characteristic.

Claim 15 is further allowable since Docter does not describe expressly or inherently permitting processing of an at least one file of the printing packet by the printer if the printing packet lacks at least one undesirable characteristic and has at least one desirable characteristic.

Claim 16 is further allowable since Docter does not describe expressly or inherently an undesirable characteristic comprising one of a file type, a file string, a source computer identifier, a user identifier, a file size, and at least one prespecified command.

Claim 17 is further allowable since Docter does not describe expressly or inherently a desirable characteristic comprising one of a source computer identifier, a user identifier, a file type, and a password.

Regarding presently amended independent claim 20, Applicant asserts that Docter does not identically describe, either expressly or inherently, each and every element of presently amended independent claim 20 in as complete detail as contained in the claim to anticipate the claimed invention under 35 U.S.C. § 102. Applicant asserts that Docter does not identically describe the element of the claimed invention calling for “a printer comprising . . . a filtering program associated with said processor so as to control printing of said at least one file.” Docter uses the phrase that “[t]he teachings of the present invention are applicable to any type of device containing a processor or controller capable of executing instructions.” *Column 3, lines 20-22*. That does not expressly or inherently identically describe a printer comprising a filtering program associated with the printer processor so as to control printing of at least one file. Therefore, for at least this reason, Docter does not anticipate presently amended independent claim 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102. Accordingly, presently amended independent claim 20 is allowable.

Applicant additionally asserts that Docter does not expressly or inherently identically describe “a packet including at least one file to be printed . . . the packet, prior to filtering, further including instructions for a printer, the instructions comprising . . . information about a source of media onto which printing of said at least one file is to be effected, information about orientation in which said at least one file is to be printed on a media, information about whether printing is to be effected on one or two sides of a media, information about a number of copies to be printed, or information about whether multiple copies should be collated.” Docter does not describe any printer instructions, let alone the instructions of claim 20. Furthermore, assuming solely for the sake of argument that Docter describes a printer, the instructions of claim 20 would not inherently be present. Therefore, Docter cannot anticipate.

Therefore, for at least these reason, Docter does not anticipate presently amended independent claim 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102. Accordingly, presently amended independent claim 20 is allowable.

Claim 21 is allowable for at least the reason of depending from allowable presently amended independent claim 20.

After carefully considering the cited art, the rejections, and the Examiner's comments, Applicant has amended the claimed invention to clearly distinguish over the cited art.

Applicant asserts that claims 1, 5-17, 20, and 21 are clearly allowable over the cited art.

Applicant requests the allowance of claims 1, 5-17, 20, and 21 and the case passed for issue.

Respectfully submitted,



James R. Duzan  
Registration No. 28,393  
Attorney for Applicant  
TRASKBRITT  
P.O. Box 2550  
Salt Lake City, Utah 84110-2550  
Telephone: 801-532-1922

Date: December 8, 2006  
JRD:KAE/dlm:lmh